

Date: Sun, 14 Aug 94 04:30:05 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #373  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 14 Aug 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    373

Today's Topics:

                    Amateur Radio Beginner  
                            CW VIEWS  
                    hamexam@scisun.sci.ccny.cuny.edu  
                    IARU's reviewing CW requirement for HF  
                    Let's kick this idea around... (2 msgs)  
                            Tech vs No-Code Tech

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 13 Aug 94 23:06:46 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Amateur Radio Beginner  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I just heard about Amateur Radio from a friend who is also beginning to  
>learn about Amateur Radio. It sounds really interesting to me and I would  
>like to learn more details about this. Are there any magazines and books  
>for Amateur radio? Or any FTP sites where I could download files  
>about Amateur Radio?  
>I am interested in learning those codes and if you know where I can  
>register for the class, do let me know. I live in Columbus, Ohio.  
>Thanks very much! :)  
>Brenda

well, i could determine a return address from what i had here so here goes...

- 1) Call the American Radio Relay League (ARRL) at 800-32-new-ham. get the prospective ham kit.
- 2) call the national amateur radio assn (different group from ARRL) at 800-got-2-ham and get their prospective ham kit.

these are free. takes about 2 weeks or so. should net you exams, classes and club information in your area.

- 3) drop by radio shack -- pick up a copy of the book "Now You're Talking" published by the ARRL. ask if the salesdroid knows anything about ham radio classes (probably a blank stare here, but sometimes you hit the jackpot..). book is about \$18-\$20. Everything you need to know to get started is in there for the most part (there's always something you'll have to learn by experience it seems...)
- 4) drop by your favorite book store and pick up the amateur radio magazines "CQ" and "73 Amateur Radio Today" and maybe "QST" if they have it (ARRL didn't used to do newsstand sales of the magazine they once called their "official organ"...now they're supposed to be doing that...but haven't noticed in Barnes and Noble, Waldenbooks, Dalton's or Bookstop -- maybe it sells out right away...?)

you'll be overwhelmed a bit by all the goings on, but you'll also get information about companies that sell amateur radio equipment and you'll see ads for the high-dollar products. occasionally, there's even an article or 2...8)

- 5) since you're at the book store, might want to ask if they have a copy of the ARRL Handbook for Radio Amateurs...your public library will probably have a copy (no accounting for how oldie-mouldy it could be...beware of ones over 10 years old due to the accumulation of the march of technology and rules changes that occur that can make some regulatory information quite obsolete. some libraries may also have obsolete licensing materials on the shelves...)
- 6) call the red cross in your area and see if they can tell you the name of the Amateur Radio Emergency Coordinator. usually a red cross chapter is also home for a radio club (the ARC folks are usually easy to sell on this...8) ). if the red cross doesn't pan out go for the Federal Emergency Management Agency....
- 7) watch the club listings in the local paper for meetings (why are radio clubs so singularly stupid on this? just takes a postcard to the paper a couple of weeks in advance...could go out with the club newsletter (but the paper doesn't probably want to even see that)).

This should be a pretty good start -- you might run into some grumpy old men but overall the average ham usually will talk your ears off about the service and it's hobby aspects...you could be sorry you asked...! 8\*)

Most places that have classes will be starting soon, so you're just in time to get on the bandwagon...

any questions?

regards (hams use 73 for this), bill wb9ivr  
w.newkirk@genie.geis.com  
wb9ivr%pubs%genav.mlb@ns14.cca.cr.rockwell.com

-----  
Date: 10 Aug 1994 12:41:22 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!nntp.ucsb.edu!mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW VIEWS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 776459553@aries, hawley@aries.scs.uiuc.edu (Chuck Hawley) writes:

>Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>>I consider it one choice from a number of modes and, as such, should be  
>>treated accordingly. I prefer CW and GM vehicles but I think \_you\_ should  
>>be \_free\_ to take \_your\_ driver's test in the vehicle of \_your\_ choice.  
>

>As I read this post, I began to see an alternate view than the one the  
>reader obviously has. If you look at the requirements as an attempt on  
>the part of the people to provide amateur radio privileges only to those  
>who meet a certain technical skill, attitude, and ability, then it's

Uh, Chuck, are you trying to imply that high speed manual decoding of Morse somehow endows you with better "technical skill, attitude, and ability"? Sorry, but I just don't see it. Unless by "ability" you mean the ability to decode Morse as an end unto itself.

>apparent that someone who wants to "chat with my friends in xxxx on SSB",  
>may well be left out. First we have to decide what is the purpose of Amateur  
>radio, and then if we are meeting that with the requirements. I'm guessing

I thought international good will \*was\* one of the purposes.  
Which purpose of Amateur radio requires Morse code?

>that "chatting with my friends" will still be left out.....even if most  
>of us who do meet the present requirements end up just chatting with our  
>friends on SSB.  
>

>  
>Chuck Hawley, KE9UW in Urbana, Illinois  
>hawley@aries.scs.uiuc.edu  
>School of Chemical Sciences, Electronic Services  
>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Brian Suggs, KE6KQY  
(And yes, that's a tech PLUS. I did learn the code, and may even use it on the air someday. I just don't follow the logic behind making it a requirement.)

-----  
Date: 12 Aug 1994 20:10:20 GMT  
From: news.columbia.edu!merhaba.cc.columbia.edu!jbaltz@RUTGERS.EDU  
Subject: hamexam@scisun.sci.ccny.cuny.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, I am making good on my threat.

hamexam@scisun.sci.ccny.cuny.edu

is a list I just had created to, well, continue the long discussion that Gary and I have been having here about the devilish details on how "we'd like to revamp the examination system".

It's not a moderated list, so try to keep the useless bitching down (useful bitching is, however, encouraged).

If we get anything done, which I hope CAN be done, we (in our youthful optimism) can at least make some changes in the upcoming Advanced and Extra examination element pools.

To join, send mail to hamexam-request@scisun.sci.ccny.cuny.edu

//jbaltz  
jerry b. altzman    Entropy just isn't what it used to be        +1 212 650 5617  
jbaltz@columbia.edu    jbaltz@sci.ccny.cuny.edu    KE3ML    (HEPNET) NEVIS::jbaltz

-----  
Date: 13 Aug 94 22:57:54 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: IARU's reviewing CW requirement for HF  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>committee members. The ARRL BOD instructed K1ZZ to oppose relaxation  
>of mandatory Morse testing.

true, but there will be elections of directors between then and now -- if the grassroots gets moving and shows up in force (i'll have to look, i seem to recall that arrl elections are won on small differentials of a relatively tiny number of league members voting....) all that could change by 1996....

bill wb9ivr

-----  
Date: Sat, 13 Aug 1994 04:42:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko) writes:

>Hmmm... that sounds easy to meet. This rule change would permit ME as  
>a licensed control op, to hand a HT to a red cross volunteer who could  
>then walk away from me (at a disaster site) and report on [fill in the  
>blank] without me having to walk over and see for myself.

Again, which purpose of amateur radio does this rule change fulfill?

Dan

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

-----  
Date: 10 Aug 1994 18:23:46 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!nntp.ucsb.edu!mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 1@aspen.uml.edu, martinja@aspen.uml.edu writes:

>In article <329ivd\$m3s@oak.oakland.edu>, prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu

>(prvalko) writes:

>

>> Well, it's NOT my idea... even though I personally like it. I tried and  
>> tried to come up with a LEGITIMATE reason why this would NOT work, and I  
>> can't. I THOUGHT the almighty flamers of rec.radio.amateur.policy would  
>> be able to... they haven't (yet).

>

>What is more legitimate than it's illegal? Anything will work but legality  
>is in question here. Geez, why don't we just put our HT's on some law

```
...long tirade deleted
```

While I agree that a CB or part 15 walkie talkies would probably fit your purpose, it got me thinking: What if you rigged an HT so it was controlled by a remote link from another radio? You could then be the (remote) control operator and the non-amateur would be covered under the third party rules. The only problem I see is that the other end of the contact is yourself, so there aren't really three parties. You would be the control operator at both ends of the conversation. Is it legal to have a QSO with yourself on amateur radio? :-)

-----

>

Allright, who let a DOS user into this group? ; -)

-----

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 1994 21:59:12 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!panther.Gsu.EDU!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!solaris.cc.vt.edu!swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3261c0\$qhv@chnews.intel.com>,  
<wyn.115.2E479881@ornl.gov><328h41\$b0@chnews.intel.com>,  
<479@ted.win.net><081194032602Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)  
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <081194032602Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) writes:

>mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>

>>

>>In article <328h41\$b0@chnews.intel.com>, Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com (Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com) writes:

>>>In article <wyn.115.2E479881@ornl.gov>, C. C. Wynn <wyn@ornl.gov> wrote:  
>>>>

>>>>No one is cramming CW down "your" throats. There are gigahertz of frequencies  
>>>>to access without demonstrating competency in Morse code. >wyn@ornl.gov  
>>>

>>>On the contrary, if the function I want to perform with amateur radio is to  
>>>chat with my friends in Australia on SSB, assuming that I never intend  
>>>to use CW after I pass the test, it has been crammed down my throat. A lot  
>>>of hams consider CW a sacred cow, others consider it a necessary evil or  
>>>even an unnecessary evil.

>>>

>>Using this logic, hasn't about 80% of the written also been crammed  
>>down your throat? (just my guess as to percentage of questions that  
>>\*don't\* have to do with HF and/or SSB -- feel free to come up with your  
>>own numbers)

>

>Using your logic Mike, wouldn't morse tests be scored with the written  
>element? Not a separate element?

>

No, that doesn't follow from the question I asked. Still, it's a possibility, \*once\* we give up our lots-for-little licensing experiment and go back to requiring a useful level of knowledge in exchange for our licenses.

Mike, KK6GM

-----  
Date: Sat, 13 Aug 1994 04:47:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.118.2E4A313C@ornl.gov>, <081194183232Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<wyn.122.2E4B78D7@ornl.gov>  
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:

>In article <081194183232Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
writes:

>

>>Gee there is an example of persuing the advancement of the radio art. Lets  
>>try and experiment with something new "NO!!!! GOD NO.. STOP... DON'T... I  
>>MIGHT HAVE TO ADVANCE AND COULDN'T DRAG AMATEUR RADIO DOWN INTO THE PIT OF  
>>HISTORY... NOT PLEASE DON'T ALLOW US TO MAKE HF USEFULL!!!!... STOP THE  
>>ADVANCEMENT PLEASE I MIGHT GET LEFT BEHIND... LOOK WHAT THOSE BASTARDS DID  
>>TO SPARK, AM AND ALL THE GOOD MODES... ALL WE HISTORY BUFFS HAVE LEFT IS  
>>CW (read manual morse encoded CW) PLEASE GOD DON'T LET IT BE THAT WE MIGHT  
>>ACTUALLY ADVANCE AND CAUSE ALL THAT HARM TO THE POOR OLD POST OFFICE..."

>

>It has become interesting to note that those who rant and rave about history  
>are those who aspire to return to conditions similar to those in the early  
>radio days when "200 meters and below" were the radio experimenter's play pen  
>with virtually no limitations. This was truly an anarchist's or libertine's  
>paradise. Grand experiments could be performed totally unfettered by the  
>likes of today's operating restrictions. So, those who point an accusatory  
>finger at the "historical preservationists" are in fact those who want to  
>return to the conditions of the early days of radio history. Rather ironic  
>don't you think?

Golly, did I say that? I think not. Looks like Herr Klinton is rubbing  
off. Just Lie about what someone said and make you point. Don't matter how  
much of a missquote or that the person never said it, make the listener  
believe it, move on.

Dan N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary  
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

-----


Date: Sat, 13 Aug 1994 10:14:41 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.113.2E4674CC@ornl.gov>, <1994Aug10.170118.16672@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,



<wyn.118.2E4A313C@ornl.gov>,   
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In article <wyn.118.2E4A313C@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:  
>In article <1994Aug10.170118.16672@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>  
>>No, I did not, nor is that what they're doing. What's happening is that  
>>an \*additional\* mode of operation is being permitted on those frequencies.  
>>I do think that's a good first step, though I'd prefer the Canadian plan  
> ^^^  
>>which has no government mandated subbands or modes, no setting aside certain  
>>frequencies for certain non-competitive modes. After the RM is in effect,  
>>you'll still be able to play John Henry on those frequencies, but now the  
>>steam hammer can play too. No more featherbedding or special work rules  
>>to keep progress out.  
>  
>Hmmm, I see. The referenced poster says no he didn't but yes he does,  
>perfectly clear.

Years of beeps seem to have damaged your reading comprehension skills.  
As I said, I did not support setting aside frequencies \*exclusively\*  
for automated operations, And, in fact, the FCC is \*not\* setting aside  
frequencies \*exclusively\* for automated operations. Indeed they are  
\*adding\* a new mode of operation on HF in small band segments, and I  
do support expanding that idea ala the Canadian system to all of the  
HF spectrum. I think mode subbands are a bad idea. There is no  
contradiction in any of that.

>It should also be pointed out that this is not just  
>another "\*additional\*" mode of operation but is unattended automatic machine  
>operation in the HF spectrum, ie. the first attempt at such on HF. If we  
>subscribe to a level playing field, how about unattended CW operation,  
>unattended RTTY operation, unattended recorded voice operation? The list goes  
>on. Actually no one who appreciates HF operations would ever seriously  
>suggest such a thing.

Nonsense. Only those clinging desperately to the status quo would object  
to new methods of operation anywhere on the amateur spectrum. In fact,  
the FCC rulemaking \*would\* make unattended RTTY or Morse operations legal  
in these band segments.

>> Use of automated stations will enhance HF data operations  
>>by making use of propagation at times of the day or night when the human  
>>licensee is not available. That should allow at least a fourfold increase  
>>in throughput and utilization without claiming more spectrum.  
>

>This comment on the use of HF propagation is obviously the product of a fertile  
>imagination, unfortunately only loosely coupled to reality. If one ever  
>listens to HF operators talk about "the band opening", they are not talking  
>about the rock band performance at the start of the show down at the Omni.  
>What they are referring to is the characteristics of propagation at certain  
>conditions of the ionosphere. These conditions vary from hour to hour, night  
>to day, season to season, and year to year, and have profound effects on HF  
>propagation. If one were to take the time to examine the characteristics of  
>the ionosphere and the cosmic forces that influence the phenomena, one should  
>conclude that there is little humanly possible that can be done to alter their  
>course. Therefore, when two or more machines are able to successfully  
>communicate between points A and B in the HF spectrum has very little to do  
>with "when the human licensee is not available".

How's that again? It's \*because\* propagation factors don't depend on the presence or absence of human operators that unattended operation will allow greater throughput. The \*machine\* will \*always\* be there to take advantage of any opening, even if the human licensee is asleep or at work. If you weren't brain damaged from too much high speed Morse, you'd have understood this the first time.

>As I have pointed out before, in discussing the unattended automatic HF machine  
>operation plan with some of its architects, (maybe they were not part of the  
>"we" group) they fully intend to create clear channel conditions attempting to  
>drive off the current users of these frequencies with QRM, although they use  
>code words such as competition, survival of the fittest, etc. to describe the  
>activity. This will obviously be attempted when the human users are there, not  
>when they are not there. In turn, what will happen is, to borrow a prophesy  
>from K1ZZ when discussing the effects of other noise generators on the HF  
>spectrum, the human users will QRO. The effect will then be to raise the  
>average noise level of the infected parts of the band -- so much for QRP and  
>RF pollution limits.

So you're claiming that these \*unattended\* machines will somehow sense when a human emulating a machine is present and purposefully generate QRM. Is that right? That should be some slick programing job, a real reverse Turing Test. I admit that some \*human\* operators may try to illegally \*jam\* the unattended stations, but unlike humans, machines have no emotions. They'll just patiently keep trying until the humans get tired of their spiteful games, go to bed, and allow the machines to complete their contacts. That's one of the advantages of machines, they have endless patience. They'll patiently wait for the right propagation conditions, they'll patiently wait for jammers to get tired, go to the bathroom, or to bed, or to jail, etc. They'll just patiently keep trying until they succeed in getting the message through. Real machines are so much better at being machines than are people trying to emulate machines. Admirable isn't it?

>>compete, then I won't cry if it goes the way of AM.

>

>AM may not be dead yet. Some say that recent actions by the FCC are  
>signalling that conservation of the HF spectrum may no longer be a high  
>priority. If this perception is correct then AM, which has some noise  
>immunity to carriers and FSK may be on the way back.

Indeed, synchronous detection does offer some real advantages in some cases. If AM *is* better at some jobs, then I certainly wouldn't stand in it's way. I don't oppose *progress* or *improved* communications. I want the very best methods used for the purpose at hand. If AM fills that bill in some cases, then by all means use AM. Unlike you, I'm not fixated on a single mode, whatever its historical significance.

>>As usual, you have things completely backwards.

>^^

>A thousand pardons! Perhaps this is just another symptom of the "idiot  
>savant" syndrome that I suffer from.

No doubt.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #373

\*\*\*\*\*